Appendix to *Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools* by the Center on Education Policy

I. Studies That Informed CEP's Principles and Recommendations

A. Papers Commissioned by CEP

CEP commissioned 11 papers for its project on rethinking the federal role in elementary and secondary education. These papers informed all of the principles and many of the recommendations presented in *Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools*. All of the commissioned papers were released in 2008 or 2009 and are available on CEP's Web site at www.cep-dc.org.

CEP received advice on the topics to be explored in the papers, possible authors, and peer reviewers of the papers from an advisory group of three nationally known experts with different areas of expertise and political views: Linda Darling-Hammond, a professor of education at Stanford University and co-director of the School Redesign Network; Eric A. Hanushek, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution; and Thomas W. Payzant, professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, former superintendent of the Boston Public Schools, and former assistant secretary for elementary and secondary education in the U.S. Department of Education. CEP was responsible for the final decision on topics, authors, and peer reviewers.

As general guidelines, we asked the authors of the papers to conduct a fact-based evaluation of past and present national education policies in a specific area; to determine the effects of these policies to the extent possible; to glean what can be learned from past experience to shape a more effective federal role in the future; and to consider new challenges and opportunities that have implications for a refashioned federal role.

Six of the papers were presented at public forums on Capitol Hill, sponsored by Republican and Democratic leaders of Congress, where they were critiqued and then revised accordingly.

The list of the commissioned papers and their authors follows:

National efforts to bring reform to scale in America's high-poverty elementary and secondary schools: Outcomes and implications
Geoffrey D. Borman, University of Wisconsin-Madison

From PLATO to podcasts: Fifty years of federal involvement in educational technology
Mathew Cherian, Graduate Student, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Standards-based reform in the United States: History, research, and future directions
Laura S. Hamilton, Brian M. Stecher, & Kun Yuan, RAND Corporation

Demographic trends and the federal role in education
Harold Hodgkinson, Hodgkinson Associates, Alexandria, VA

Advancing ECE^2 policy: Early childhood education (ECE) and its quest for excellence, coherence, and equity (ECE)
Sharon L. Kagan & Jeanne L. Reid, Teachers College, Columbia University

The federal role in education: Lessons from Australia, Germany, and Canada
Chad R. Lykins & Stephen P. Heyneman, Vanderbilt University

Federal aid to elementary and secondary education: Premises, effects, and major lessons learned
Paul Manna, College of William and Mary

The role of assessment in federal education programs
W. James Popham, University of California, Los Angeles

What the federal government can do to improve high school performance
Russell W. Rumberger, University of California, Santa Barbara

Fifty years of federal teacher policy: An appraisal
Gary Sykes & Kenne Dibner, Michigan State University

The federal role in out-of-school learning: After-school, summer learning, and family involvement as critical learning supports
Heather B. Weiss, Priscilla M. D. Little, Suzanne M. Bouffard, Sarah N. Deschenes, & Helen Janc Malone, Harvard Family Research Project

B. Compendium of NCLB Research

In addition to commissioning the papers above, CEP compiled a *Compendium of Key Studies of the No Child Left Behind Act*, which is available on CEP's Web site at www.cep-dc.org. This compendium briefly summarizes the major research on the No Child Left Behind Act. The compendium includes research-based studies of significant policy issues that had been published since 2005; were national or regional in scope; were conducted using well-established research methods by scholars, government agencies, or organizations with expertise in NCLB; and were accessible on the Web.

Deciding which studies to include sometimes involved making judgment calls—determining, for example, what constitutes a significant policy issue. We tried to make these judgments in good faith without regard to our own views about the findings of the studies. A CEP senior consultant and two research interns reviewed the findings of the selected studies and developed summaries of each. Wayne Riddle and Joel Packer, two experts who have closely tracked NCLB research since the law's inception, reviewed the list of studies and the content of the summaries and suggested additions and revisions.

C. Studies That Informed CEP's Recommendations

The reference list below shows the studies, in addition to the 11 commissioned papers, that support specific points raised in the discussion of principles and recommendations in *Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools.* Many, though not all, of these studies are contained in the NCLB research compendium described above.

Principles 1-5

Center on Education Policy. (1999). *A brief history of the federal role in education: Why it began and why it's still needed*. Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2007). *Educational architects: Do state education agencies have the tools necessary to implement NCLB?* Washington, DC: Author.

Civil Rights Project at Harvard University. (2006.) *Massive responsibilities and limited resources: The state response to NCLB.* Cambridge, MA: Author.

Erpenbach, W.J. (2008). *Statewide educational accountability systems under the NCLB Act—A report on 2008 amendments to state plans.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Grissmer, D.W., Kirby, S.N., Berends, M., & Williamson, S. (1994). *Student achievement and the changing American family.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

LeFloch, K.C., Boyle, A., & Therriault, S.B. (2008). *Help wanted: State capacity for school improvement.* Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Rothstein, R. *Class and schools: Using social, economic, and educational reform to close the black-white achievement gap.* New York, NY: Economic Policy Institute and Teachers College, Columbia University.

Sunderman, G., & Orfield, G. (2006). G. *Massive responsibilities and limited resources: The state response to NCLB.* Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Multiple recommendations

American Federation of Teachers. (2006, July). Smart testing: Let's get it right. How assessment-savvy have states become since NCLB? *Policy brief 19*. Retrieved on February 5, 2010, from http://archive.aft.org/pubs-reports/downloads/teachers/Testingbrief.pdf [Recommendations 2 & 3]

Center on Education Policy. (2005). *From the capital to the classroom: Year 3 of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1, 4, 5, 8 & 9]

Center on Education Policy. (2006). *From the capital to the classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1, 5, 8 & 9]

Center on Education Policy (2008). *Has student achievement increased since 2002? State test score trends through 2006-07.* Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1 & 7]

Center on Education Policy. (2009). *State test score trends through 2007-08, part 1: Is the emphasis on "proficiency" shortchanging higher- and lower-achieving students?* Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1 & 7]

Commission on No Child Left Behind. (2007). *Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the promise to our nation's children.* Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute. [Recommendations 2 & 9]

Commission on No Child Left Behind. (2007). *The state of the achievement gap.* Commission staff research report, the Aspen Institute. Retrieved on February 5, 2010, from http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/commission%20on%20no%20child%20left%20behind/AchievementGap1.19.07.pdf [Recommendations 7, 8 & 9]

Hall, D., & Kennedy, S. (2006). *Primary progress, secondary challenge: A state-by-state look at student achievement patterns.* Washington, DC: The Education Trust. [Recommendations 1 & 7]

Hannaway, J., & Hamilton, L. (2008). *Performance-based accountability policies: Implications for school and classroom practices.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute and RAND. [Recommendations 1 & 3]

Marsh, J.A., & Robyn, A. (2006). *School and district improvement efforts in response to the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: RAND. [Recommendations 1 and 5]

Mathis, W. J. (2006*). The accuracy and effectiveness of adequate yearly progress, NCLB's school evaluation system.* Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, Education Policy Research Unit. [Recommendations 1 & 4]

U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2007). *National assessment of title I: Final report, vol. I.* Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1, 2, 8 & 9]

U. S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. (2008). *The nation's report card: NAEP 2008 trends in academic progress.* Washington, DC: Author. [Recommendations 1 & 7]

Recommendation 1 ***(Standards-based reform)***

Bishop, J., Mane, F., & Bishop, M. (2001). *Is standards-based reform working? And for whom?* Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, CAHRS Working Paper Series. Retrieved on July 31, 2009, from http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrswp/74/

Carnoy, M., & Loeb, S. (2002). Does external accountability affect student outcomes? A cross-state analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*, 305-331.

Center on Education Policy. (2005). *States test limits of federal AYP flexibility*. Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2007). *Answering the question that matters most: Has student achievement increased since No Child Left Behind?* Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2007). *Choices, changes, and challenges: Curriculum and instruction in the NCLB era.* Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2008). *Instructional time in elementary schools: A closer look at changes for specific subjects*. Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2009). *Lessons from the classroom level about federal and state accountability in Rhode Island and Illinois*. Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2009). *State test score trends through 2007-08, part 2: Is there a plateau effect in test scores?* Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy (2009). *State test score trends through 2007-08, part 3: Are achievement gaps closing and is achievement rising for all?* Washington, DC: Author.

Council of the Great City Schools. (2008). *Beating the odds: An analysis of student performance and achievement gaps on state assessments. Results from the 2006-2007 school year.* Washington, DC: Author.

Cronin, J., Kingsbury G.G., McCall, M.S., & Bowe, B. (2005). *The impact of the No Child Left Behind Act on student achievement and growth: 2005 edition*. Lake Oswego, OR: Northwest Evaluation Association.

Duffett, A., Farkas, S., & Loveless, T. (2008). *High-achieving students in the era of NCLB.* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

Fuller, B., Gesicki, K., Kang, E., & Wright, J. (2006). *Is the No Child Left Behind Act working? The reliability of how states track achievement.* Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Fuller, B., Wright, J., Gesicki, K., & Kang, E. (2007). *Gauging growth*: *How to judge No Child Left Behind?* Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Gribben, M.A., Campbell, H.L, & Mathew, J. (2008). *Are advanced students advancing? Examining achievement trends beyond proficiency.* Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO).

Hamilton, L.S., Stecher, B.M., Marsh, J., McCombs, J.S., Robyn, A., Russell, J., Naftel, S., & Barney, H. (2007). *Standards-based accountability under NCLB: Experiences of teachers and administrators in three states.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Lee, J., & Wong, K. (2004). The impact of accountability on racial and socioeconomic equity: Considering both school resources and achievement outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal, 41,* 797–832 (working paper). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2008). *Grading education: Getting accountability right.* Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute and Teachers College Press.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. (2008). *Comparison between NAEP and state mathematics assessment results, 2003*. Washington, DC: Author.

Recommendation 2 ***(Standards)***

American Federation of Teachers. (2008). *Sizing up state standards 2008.* Retrieved on February 5, 2010, from http://archive.aft.org/pubs-reports/downloads/teachers/standards2008.pdf

Bandeira de Mello, V., Blankenship, C., & McLaughlin, D. (2009). *Mapping state proficiency standards onto NAEP scales: 2005-2007.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Carey, K. (2006). *Hot air: How states inflate their educational progress under NCLB.* Education Sector. Retrieved on February 5, 2010, from http://www.educationsector.org/research/research_show.htm?doc_id=373044

Cronin, J., Dahlin, M. Adkins, D., & Kingsbury, G.G. (2007). *The proficiency illusion*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

Cronin, J., Dahlin, M., Xiang, Y., & McCahon, D. (2009). *The accountability illusion.* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute

Finn, Jr., C.E., Petrilli, M.J., & Julian, L. (2006). *2006: The state of state standards.* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2005). *Analysis of state K-3 reading standards and assessments*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Mapping 2005 state proficiency standards onto the NAEP scales.* Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (2007). *State and local implementation of the NLCB Act, vol. III—Accountability under NCLB: Interim report.* Washington, DC: Author.

Recommendation 3 ***(Assessments)***

Darling-Hammond, L., & Pecheone, R. (2009). Reframing accountability: Using performance assessments to focus learning on higher-order skills. In L. M. Pinkus (Ed.), *Meaningful measurement: The role of assessments in improving high school education in the twenty-first century*, 25-53. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Kober, N. (2002). What tests can and cannot tell us. *TestTalk for Leaders, 2*. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.

National Academy of Education. (2008). *Standards, assessment, and accountability.* Education Policy White Paper. Retrieved on February 5, 2010, from http://www.naeducation.org/Standards_Assessments_Accountability_White_Paper.pdf

National Research Council, Board on Testing and Assessment. (2007). *Lessons learned about testing: Ten years of work at the National Research Council.* Retrieved on January 21, 2010, from http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bota/Lessons_Learned_Brochure.pdf

Tanner, J. (2009.) College and work readiness as a goal of high schools: The role of standards, assessments, and accountability. In L. M. Pinkus (Ed.), *Meaningful measurement: The role of assessments in improving high school education in the twenty-first century*, 9-23. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Recommendation 4 ***(Systems for continuous improvement)***

Betebenner, D.W. (2008). *Norm- and criterion-referenced student growth.* National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment. Retrieved on July 28, 2009, from http://www.nciea.org/publications/normative_criterion_growth_DB08.pdf

Center on Education Policy. (2008). *Many states have taken a "backloaded" approach to NCLB's goal of all students scoring "proficient."* Washington, DC: Author.

Ho, A. D. (2008). The problem with "proficiency": Limitations of statistics and policy under No Child Left Behind. *Educational Researcher, 37*(6), 351-360.

Linn, R. L., Baker, E. L., & Betebenner, D. W. (2002). Accountability systems: Implications of requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *Educational Researcher, 31*(6), 3-16.

Linn, R. L. (2003, July). *Accountability: Responsibility and reasonable expectations.* Technical report. Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Evaluation, CRESST.

Linn, Robert. (2005). Fixing the accountability system. *CRESST Policy Brief 8.* Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Evaluation, CRESST. Retrieved on July 29, 2009, from www.cse.ucla.edu/products/policy/cresst_policy8.pdf

Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2006). *"Proficiency for all"—an oxymoron.* Paper prepared for the symposium, "Examining America's Commitment to Closing Achievement Gaps: NCLB and Its Alternatives," sponsored by the Campaign for Educational Equity, Teachers College, Columbia University, November 13-14, 2006. Economic Policy Institute.

Wiley, E., Mathis, W.J., & Garcia, D.R. (2005). *The impact of the adequate yearly progress requirement of the federal "No Child Left Behind" Act on schools in the Great Lakes region.* East Lansing, MI: Great Lakes Center for Education Research and Practice.

Zvoch, K., & Stevens, J. J. (2003). A multilevel, longitudinal analysis of middle school math and language achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11*(20). Retrieved on July 28, 2009, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n20/

Recommendation 5 ***(Support to low-performing schools)***

Burch, P. (2007). *Supplemental educational services under NCLB: Emerging evidence and policy issues.* Education Public Interest Center at University of Colorado–Boulder and Education Policy Research Unit at Arizona State University. Retrieved on July 30, 2009, from http://epsl.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPSL-0705-232-EPRU.pdf

Burch, P., Steinberg, M., & Donovan, J. (2007). Supplemental educational services and NCLB: Policy assumptions, market practices, emerging issues. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 29*(2), 115-133.

Calkins, A., Guenther, W., Belfiore, G., & Lash, D. (2007). *The turnaround challenge.* Mass Insight Education and Research Institute. Retrieved on February 5, 2010, from http://www.massinsight.org/micontent/trnresources.aspx

Casserly, M. (2006). *No Child Left Behind in America's Great City Schools: Five years and counting.* Washington, DC: Council of Great City Schools.

Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2006). *School restructuring under No Child Left Behind: What works when? A guide for education leaders.* Washington, DC: Learning Point Associates.

Center for Research on Educational Outcomes, Stanford University. (2009). *Multiple choice: Charter school performance in 16 states.* Retrieved on January 21, 2010, from http://credo.stanford.edu/reports/MULTIPLE_CHOICE_CREDO.pdf

Center on Education Policy. (2007). *State implementation of supplemental educational services under NCLB.* Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2008). *A call to restructure restructuring: Lessons from the No Child Left Behind Act.* Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2009). *Improving low-performing schools: Lessons from five years of studying school restructuring under No Child Left Behind.* Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy (2009). *Mining the opportunities in "differentiated accountability": Lessons learned from the No Child Left Behind pilots in four states.* Washington, DC: Author.

DiBiase, R.W. (2005). *State involvement in school restructuring under No Child Left Behind in the 2004-2005 school year.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Government Accountability Office. (2006). *No Child Left Behind Act: Education actions needed to improve local implementation and state evaluation of supplemental educational services.* Washington, DC: Author.

Hamilton, L.S., Stecher, B.M., Marsh, J., McCombs, J.S., Robyn, A., Russell, J., Naftel, S., & Barney, H. (2007). *Implementing standards-based accountability under No Child Left Behind: Responses of superintendents, principals, and teachers in three states.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Hassel, B., Hassel, E., & Rhim, L.M. (2007). Overview of restructuring. In H. Walberg (Ed.), *Handbook on restructuring and substantial school improvement*, 9–22. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation and Improvement.

Sunderman, G. (2007). *Supplemental educational services under NCLB: Charting implementation.* Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project, UCLA.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development. (2007). *State and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, vol. I: Title I school choice, supplemental educational services, and student achievement.* Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2008). *State and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, vol. IV—Title I school choice and supplemental educational services: Interim report*. Washington, DC: Author.

Zimmer, R., Gill, B., Booker, K., Lavertu, S., Sass, T.R., & Witte, J. (2009). *Charter schools in eight states: Effects on achievement, attainment, integration, and competition.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Recommendation 6 ***(Resource equity)***

Biddle, B.J., & Berliner, D. (2002). *What research says about unequal funding for schools in America.* San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Education Trust. (2008). *No accounting for fairness: Equitable education funding.* Retrieved on January 21, 2010, from www.edtrust.org/dc/resources/publications?tid=5&tid_1=All

Education Week. (2010). *Quality counts: Holding all states to high standards, school finance.* Retrieved on January 21, 2010, from http://www.edweek.org/media/ew/qc/2010/17sos.h29.finance.pdf

Roza, M. (2008). What if we closed the Title I comparability loophole? *Ensuring equal opportunity in public education.* Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Recommendation 7 ***(High school reform)***

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2009). *Understanding high school graduation rates* (updated July 2009). Retrieved on February 5, 2010, from http://www.all4ed.org/publication_material/understanding_HSgradrates

Balfanz, R. & Legters, N. (2004). Locating the dropout crisis: Which high schools produce the nation's dropouts? In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Dropouts in America*, 57-84. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Borman, G.D. (2003). Experiments for educational evaluation and improvement. *Peabody Journal of Education, 77*(4), 7-27.

Center on Education Policy. (2007). *Implementing the No Child Left Behind teacher requirements*. Washington, DC: Author.

Corcoran, T. & Silander, M. (2009). Instruction in high schools: The evidence and the challenge. *Future of Children, 19,* 157-183.

Education Trust. (2005). *Stalled in secondary: A look at student achievement since the No Child Left Behind Act.* Washington, DC: Author.

Recommendation 8 ***(Students with disabilities and English language learners)***

Asian-American Legal Defense and Education Fund. (2008). *Left in the margins: Asian American students and the No Child Left Behind Act.* New York: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2004). *From the capital to the classroom: Year 2 of the No Child Left Behind Act.* Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy. (2007). *No Child Left Behind at five: A review of changes to state accountability plans*. Washington, DC: Author.

Center on Education Policy (2009). *State test score trends through 2007-08, part 4: Has progress been made in raising achievement for students with disabilities?* Washington, DC: Author.

Government Accountability Office. (2006). *Assistance from Education could help states better measure progress of students with limited English proficiency*. Washington, DC: Author.

Government Accountability Office (2009). *No Child Left Behind Act: Enhancements in the Department of Education's review process could improve state academic assessments.* Retrieved on September 26, 2009, from http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09911.pdf

How NCLB affects students with disabilities: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor H. hrg. 110-18) U.S. House of Representatives, 110th Cong., 1st Sess. (2007, March 29) (testimony of Rachel Quenemoen).

No Child Left Behind: Improving results for children with disabilities: Hearing before the Committee on Education and the Workforce (H. hrg. 108-45) U.S. House of Representatives, 108th Cong., 2d Sess. (2004, March 3) (testimony of Martha Thurlow, NCLB and the inclusion of students with disabilities in accountability and assessment systems).

Pinkus, L. M (ed.) (2009). *Meaningful measurement: The role of assessments in improving high school education in the twenty-first century.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Thompson, S. J., Johnstone, C. J., Thurlow, M. L., & Altman, J. R. (2005). *2005 State special education outcomes: Steps forward in a decade of change*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved on February 5, 2010, from http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/2005StateReport.htm/

Recommendation 9 ***(Teacher quality)***

Center on Education Policy. (2007.) *Implementing the No Child Left Behind teacher requirements.* Washington, DC: Author.

Education Trust. (2006). *Missing the mark: An Education Trust analysis of teacher-equity plans.* Washington, DC: Author.

Government Accountability Office. (2005). *No Child Left Behind Act: Improved accessibility to Education's information could help states further implement teacher qualification requirements.* Washington, DC: Author.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement.* Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee, Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2007). *State and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, vol. II—Teacher quality under NCLB: interim report*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2008). *Findings from the 2007-08 survey on the use of funds under Title II, Part A.* Washington, DC: Author.

Recommendation 10 ***(Complementary learning)***

Barnett, W. S., & Yarosz, D. J. (2007). *Who goes to preschool and why does it matter?* National Institute for Early Education Research. Retrieved on August 15, 2008, from http://nier.org/resources/policybriefs/15.pdf

Black, A. R., Doolittle, F., Zhu, P., Unterman, R., & Grossman, J. B. (2008). *The evaluation of enhanced academic instruction in after-school programs: Findings after the first year of implementation*. (NCEE 2008-4021). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Cohen, A. J. (1996). A brief history of federal financing for child care in the Untied States. *The Future of Children, 6*(2), 26-40.

Denton, D. R. (2002). *Summer school: Unfulfilled promise*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved on September 12, 2008, from http://www.sreb.org/programs/srr/pubs/Summer_School.pdf

Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., & Olson, L. S. (2001). Keep the faucet flowing: Summer learning and home environment. *American Educator, 25*(3), 10-15, 47. Retrieved on September 14, 2008, from http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/fall2001/faucet.html

Ewen, D. & Matthews, H. (2007). *Title I and early education programs: A look at investments in the NCLB era.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Granger, R. C., & William T. Grant Foundation. (2008). After-school programs and academics: Implications for policy, practice, and research. *Social Policy Report, XXII*(2).

Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(2), 275-313.

Little, P. M. D., Wimer, C., & Weiss, H. B. (2008). After school programs in the 21st century: Their potential and what it takes to achieve it. Issues and opportunities in out-of-school time evaluation. *Brief Number 10*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

Mahoney, J. L., Lord, H., & Carryl, E. (2005). An ecological analysis of after-school program participation and the development of academic performance and motivational attributes for disadvantaged children. *Child Development, 76*(4), 811-825.

Peck, S. C., Roeser, R. W., Zarrett, N., & Eccles, J. S. (2008). Exploring the roles of extracurricular activity quantity and quality in the educational resilience of vulnerable adolescents: Variable- and pattern-centered approaches. *Journal of Social Issues, 64*(2), 430.

U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *When schools stay open late: The national evaluation of the 21st-century learning centers program, first year findings*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved on September 9, 2008, from www.ed.gov/pubs/21cent/firstyear

Vandell, D. L., Reisner, E., & Pierce, K. (2007). *Outcomes linked to high-quality afterschool programs: Longitudinal findings from the study of promising practices*. Irvine, CA: University of California and Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. Retrieved on September 8, 2008 from http://www.gse.uci.edu/docs/PASP%20Final%20Report.pdf